

CMER Meeting Notes

3/28/01- United Church- Olympia

Co-Chair and Core Membership of CMER

Doug Martin offered to serve as co-chairman along with Timothy Quinn. All members in attendance gave their approval. However, official approval may be required from Policy. T. Quinn said he would carry the recommendation forward to Policy. Terms of co-chairs was also discussed. The group recommended that CMER co-chairs have rotating and staggered terms that would range from one to two years.

The group discussed the purpose of core membership. Essentially core membership is only needed to resolve disputes. If a core member does not concur with a consensus position, then any final decisions or dispute resolution process can only be made by the core members. Non-core members cannot initiate a dispute resolution process.

The group discussed that CMER needs a process for making decisions that is clearly defined before a decision is made. For example, some members did not understand how the project prioritizing process worked so they did not participate when the votes were made. The group agreed that critical decisions need to be clearly explained ahead of time.

Conflict of Interest

Each SAG is responsible for checking for any conflict of interest among its members when proposals and study plans are being developed that will be put out for competitive bid. The SAGs need to be sure that those who could benefit will not be involved in the decision process. If questions about conflict of interest occur, the SAGs are responsible for answering to CMER on how a conflict was addressed.

Budget Update and Project Priority

Jeff Grizzel gave a summary of potential state and federal funding for the coming biennium. The current expectations for the 01-03 biennium are 1.2 M from state and 1.536 M from federal for total of \$2.736 M.

The group discussed how to spend certain funds that needed to be allocated by the end of June, 2001. The decision was to maintain the current project prioritization and to move on these projects as soon as possible. Because project start-ups will probably not follow in order of their project priority, the group agreed that projects should get funded when they are ready. The priority list of eleven projects should be used as a guide for the order of funding, however we expect there will be changes in the funding order due to the logistics of getting study plans and proposals developed.

Jeff Grizzel plans to prepare and present the CMER projects and priorities to Policy at there next meeting. To help prepare this list, he asked the SAGs to identify how their projects relate to the L-1 and L-2 lists.

Scientific Review Committee

Doug Martin asked the group for consensus on the following issues:

1) The FPB directed CMER to define a process for deciding what type of work products gets reviewed by the Scientific Review Committee (SRC). The Board noted that it may be too costly and cumbersome to have every proposal and every report reviewed by the SRC. In response to the FPB request, Doug proposed the following guidelines, which received consensus by the group:

1. All project study designs and reports that are funded by CMER will be reviewed internally by the appropriate SAG.
2. Each SAG will determine the need for a SRC review of their project and will provide a written summary to CMER stating the rationale for why a review is or is not recommended or if there is a dispute.
3. CMER will review each SAG's recommendation and will make a decision whether or not a review is necessary.
4. CMER decisions on review needs will be based on:
 - How important the project results may be for making rule revisions
 - The probability of the results being technically challenged.
 - The level of scientific uncertainty associated with the study.
 - Independence of the original work.
 - Expertise of SAG to evaluate review needs.

2) Doug informed the group that he had limited response to his search for a facilitator of the SRC. So he recommended that CMER should send out a Request for Qualifications and Quotations (RFQQ) from individuals or institutions interested in facilitating the SRC. The group agreed. The group also agreed that CMER should plan to evaluate the respondents to the RFQQ and make a final recommendation to the FPB in late spring.

3) Because the SRC will not be functional until the RFQQ process is completed, Doug recommended that the SAGs should facilitate ad hoc scientific peer reviews of project designs and reports. The group agreed.

Coordination of Studies for Type N Streams

Because the Monitoring Design Team (MDT), RSAG, BTSAG, LWEG, and ERSAG all have potential projects concerning Type N streams, the group had a discussion of who was doing what and who was collaborating with whom. Dave Schuett-Hames and Bill Ehinger led the discussion and told the group how the MDT pilot study was working with RSAG and BTSAG. It was evident from the questions that more collaboration was needed. So Dave agreed to convene a meeting with all interested parties to discuss how to better integrate the various studies.

ERSAG Issue

Pete Peterson conveyed a message from his fellow ERSAG members that they want to be listed as an independent SAG and not a subgroup of RSAG. He said the group does not want to be restricted to riparian issues. Rather they want to act as coordinators and advisors for all projects that pertain to the eastside. CMER members were not in disagreement, but were concerned about overlap of effort and potential conflicts between

projects. The group asked Pete to have ERSAG give some feedback to CMER on how they would operate and how they would prevent potential problems.

Next Meeting

April 26. Time and place to be announced.